ISSN 0317-2473

Research Discussion Paper No. 63

THE EMERGENCE OF MULTIETHNICITIES IN 1981 AND 1986: THEIR SOCIOCULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

by

Karol J Krótki

and

Dave Odynak

Department of Sociology
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta

February 1990

90-06452/

THE EMERGENCE OF MULTIETHNICITIES IN 1981 AND 1986:
Their sociocultural significance

Karol J Krótki and Dave Odynak
University of Alberta

Table of contents

-. Précis

1. Statisticians respond to social reality
2. The Canadian definition static and inflexible
3. Assimilation, intermarriage and multiethnicity
4. The measurement of interethnic differentials in multiethnicity
5. The cost of multiethnicity in terms of single origins
6. The particular case of Quebec
7. Some ambitious measurements in the future
8. Data requirements for ideal measurements of multiethnicity
9. Multiculturalism and the emerging multiethnicity

Endnotes

References

Appendix: Hypotheses for emergence of multiethnicities

Figure

1. Endogamy, exogamy, time of immigration

Tables

1. Selected ethnic origins showing single and multiple origins Canada 1986
2. Selected ethnic origins showing single and multiple origins Quebec and Ontario 1986
3. Selected ethnic origins showing single and multiple origins Manitoba and Alberta 1986
4. Selected ethnic origins according to single origins Intercensal changes 1971-81, 1981-86, 1971-86 Canada

5. Selected ethnic origins according to single origins
Intercensal changes 1971-81, 1981-86, 1971-86 Quebec

6. Selected ethnic origins according to single origins
Intercensal changes 1971-81, 1981-86, 1971-86 Ontario

7. Selected ethnic origins according to single origins
Intercensal changes 1971-81, 1981-86, 1971-86 Manitoba

8. Selected ethnic origins according to single origins
Intercensal changes 1971-81, 1981-86, 1971-86 Alberta

9. Average multiple ethnicities
Canada, provinces and territories 1986

THE EMERGENCE OF MULTIETHNICITIES IN 1981 AND 1986
Their sociocultural significance

Karol J Krótki and Dave Odynak
University of Alberta

Précis

A comparison is made of the numbers and proportions self-reporting various ethnic groups varying from census of 1971 to census of 1986. Quite an analytic mileage can be gotten out of the arithmetical comparison of the numbers reported: single ethnicities in total, multiethnicities in total, multiple ethnicities as averages, differential changes between 1971, 1981 and 1986, and the like. A typology suggests itself capable of arranging taxonomically the various pecking orders adopted by ethnicities. A suggestion is made to Statistics Canada for counting of multiethnicities, superior it is claimed to current practices. Instead of giving each reported multiethnicity a value of one as was the practice in 1981 and 1986 (or imputing them away as was the case for summary tabulations in 1981), a value of 1/k should be used, where k = the number of ethnicities reported by each individual respondent. The analytic advantages and disadvantages of such an arrangement are considered.

Demographic sophistication brings along its powerful orthodox possibilities. It also opens new insights for sociological investigation. The importance of the period of migration, the size of the ethnic group, absolute and relative to others, its dispersion, its cohesion and self-image are among the influences affecting reported multiethnicities and should be used for standardization to increase comparability when the relevant variables become available. "Losses" and "gains", differential by ethnic groups, are then shown and fed into estimates of the prevalence of pluralism against a melting-pot development.

Multiethnicity is viewed methodologically throughout the paper as a natural and obvious outcome of the developing ethnic structure of the Canadian society; a case of statisticians and census takers responding to changes in the social reality. Substantively, multiethnicity is taken as an indicator and a measure of marital assimilation acting as a conduit from structural assimilation to cultural assimilation.

THE EMERGENCE OF MULTIETHNICITIES IN 1981 AND 1986:
Their sociocultural significance

Karol J Krótki and Dave Odynak
University of Alberta

1. Statisticians respond to social reality

After a century of reasonably consistent adherence to the Canadian definition of ethnicity a mild change took place during the 1981 population census. A radical departure in the definition of ethnicity was instituted during the 1986 population census. Details of the minor departures from and changes in the Canadian definitions are given in Chapter 2 by John Kralt. For the purpose of our chapter it is sufficient to recall that the Canadian definition required going back to the ethnic or cultural origin of one's ancestor on the paternal side right to the time of his first (not hers, by definition) arrival on these shores.

Except for Amerindians and the Inuit, it was, therefore, impossible for anyone else to report an ethnicity as Canadian or American, notwithstanding the fact that at each census 50,000 or 100,000 sturdy individuals insisted on writing-in "Canadian" or "American."[1] There was, of course, no pre-printed provision for such entries. Canada was, thus, possibly the only country in the world where a citizen could not declare themselves as a national of the country. This anomaly was one of the criticisms levied against the definition, though not the most important one.

Another criticism was that being limited to one and a long past ethnicity often did violence to the reality of the situation. For

example, a fourth generation Canadian had to label oneself by the ethnicity which might have been responsible for one-sixteenth of his/her blood, if the first arrival and his progeny (hers, as explained, was not relevant) did not marry within the original ethnicity. Even in less extreme cases, with the passage of time and generations the labelling required by the Canadian definition became less and less realistic and even less message-conveying. Still, the society could be meaningfully broken up by the Canadian definition of ethnicity into distinct groups, as was the case, for example, with the use of the child-woman ratio for the study of ethnic fertility. There was life in the old dog for a long time to come, notwithstanding the continuous criticism levied at it in academic circles.[2] It was easy to point out disadvantages of the definition, more difficult to say what could be put in its place.

In the fulness of time census takers saw the light of the day and fell in with the considerable number of respondents in 1981 who spontaneously began writing-in more than one ethnicity. Close to two million people out of 24 million, or 8 percent, had multiple ethnic origins entered on their census forms.[3] By 1986 census takers turned this spontaneity into census instruction. This new instruction opened the alternative to anybody inclined to use it. We are now confronted with an entirely new ball game. Academicians who like the comfort of a one-to-one correspondence between reality and available data will open a sniping campaign against these new results. Still, adequate provisions must be made for this variable of ethnic origin. There is too much socio-political pressure behind this variable for it to be ignored and social scientists benefit from the provisions made to satisfy this

demand. Statisticians and census-takers do not engage in social engineering, they merely try to measure social reality.[4]

The purpose of this chapter is to report what use the 24 million of Canadian respondents made of the new freedom to report their ethnicities and to undertake a first attempt at developing analytic means of drawing conclusions from the reported multiethnicities, much more numerous than the number of Canadians.

2. The Canadian definition static and inflexible

In the previous section we said that the inadmissability of the declaration "Canadian" on the census form was one of the criticisms levied against the definition. Another criticism must have been the fact that it did not allow for the assimilation of ethnic groups to each other or for the assimilation of the minority groups to the predominant culture. Every respondent was stuck with whatever was the ethnic origin of the paternal ancestor at the time of first arrival on these shores.

Obviously, the Canadian definition was static and was not capable to reflect the process of assimilation, subtle perhaps to begin with, but eventually resulting in radical changes and extreme transformations, such as the virtual disappearance of entire ethnic identities. Yet, in a formal sense and under the strict application of Canada's definition the ethnicities of Canada would survive forever (unless dying out through low fertility) and with progressive assimilation, as purely formal structures and meaningless identities.

One cannot pretend at this early stage to be certain how these new data arising in 1981 and 1986 will affect the relevant analytical

outcomes. However, it must be cleared already, that the inputs will not be static and that they will be flexible. Multiethnicities will measure assimilation by definition: the greater the admixture the more obvious the emergence of the melting pot.

Multiethnicities are the outcome of intermarriages by definition. In themselves, intermarriages can be viewed as the opening step to cultural assimilation. The marriage partners may use both languages, if the languages of the two ethnic groups are different, interchangeably, or they may settle for the use of one language, or, most likely, they opt for the language of the majority. Opting for the language of the majority, may appear particularly convenient, if there are, as was the case until recently with most couples, children around. The data on multiethnicity will alert the social scientist to developments taking place, though they alone will not be able to disclose, which solution the couple adopted. Nor will social scientists alone be able to identify uniethnic couples who switch to the language of the majority under no particular compulsion. The social scientist may also be alerted through the multiethnicity data to the possibility that intermarriage may have been facilitated by structural assimilation.

Thus, the emergence of a possible way to measure intermarriages through multiethnicities provides us with a central and pivotal point of passage leading possibly from structural assimilation to, more certainly, cultural assimilation.

We argue in the next section, whether intermarriage is the inevitable passage from structural assimilation to cultural assimilation as suggested in the previous paragraphs. Whatever the outcome of this discussion,

multiethnicity is the source to provide the objective indicator of what is happening. This paper is one such attempt to assess the importance of multiethnicity.

3. Assimilation, intermarriage and multiethnicity

A major question facing us throughout this paper will be whether we view intermarriage as leading to a loss of ethnic identity or as acting as a means of recruitment for ethnic groups. We view the issue as one of interpreting the data as battleground for some endogamous losses but more on the level of exogamous gains (see subsequent definitions in section 4). Canadian evidence has tended to emphasize and support the explanation that a loss of ethnic identity occurs through intermarriage (Goldstein & Segall 1985).

According to the assimilationist perspective intermarriage can be portrayed both as a precursor to or following forms of "structural assimilation" whereby minority groups attain entrance into the major institutions of society (Gordon 1964). Under this theoretical perspective once marital assimilation takes place other forms of assimilation occur. Structural assimilation is dependent on the degree of primary group type relations. "The primary group is a group in which contact is personal, informal, intimate, and usually face-to-face, and which involves the entire personality, not just a segmentalized part of it" (Gordon 1964:31). Primary group relations for an ethnic group will be characterized by high intragroup contact, and endogamous marriages with relatives and close friends from the same ethnic group.

"Cultural assimilation" as opposed to structural assimilation refers more to the adaptation processes of ethnic groups to "everyday" norms of

the host culture. Under cultural assimilation one begins a remarkable transformation from Ukrainian to Ukrainian-Canadian, Italian to Italian-Canadian and so forth. Secondary group relations predominate for the cultural assimilated where members of different ethnic groups participate in less personal spheres of activity. According to Gordon (1964:32) "... secondary group is a group in which contacts tend to be impersonal, formal or causal, non-intimate, and segmentalized; in some cases they are face-to-face, in others not." A prominent feature of the assimilationist perspective is that there are clear "losers" from intermarriage among participating ethnic groups because of the erosion of primary group relations that were focused within the ethnic group.

Under our perspective some ethnic groups are endogamous losers and some are exogamous gainers. No emphasis is placed on the possibility that intermarriage can lead to a one-sided victory that is so complete that, say, an Italian becomes a Ukrainian whose primary relations are entirely focused on the Ukrainian community. Such instances are rare. On the one hand, there may be continued erosion of the primary group relations centred on an ethnic group when endogamous marriages within an ethnicity are lost. On the other hand, exogamous gains can be expected for an ethnicity not so much at the primary group level but at the secondary level. A major question arises whether we mourn the loss of endogamous marriages that perpetuated particular forms of primary group relations for an ethnic group and then view the gains resulting from intermarriage in name and numbers only for an ethnicity at the secondary level.

In this paper we do not need to give answers and take sides. We concentrate on the new tool of multiethnicity to measure the process.

Once ethnicity becomes a random element in marriage selection and determination, the biological basis for the preservation of ethnicities will disappear. The need for ethnicity questions and the related demands will be gone. We are probably on our way to such a state, but in the meantime the matter is lively and topical. Apparently ethnic groups take part in the process with considerable differences in pace, quantity and possibly quality, a subject taken up in the next section.

4. The measurement of interethnic differentials in multiethnicity

For the comparison of single origins with multiple origins for each ethnic group several indices come to mind and the easiest is to contrast the numbers of singles with the number of multiples. Other things being equal, an ethnic group beginning with large numbers would have opportunities correspondingly large for intermarrying, a small group would have more limited opportunities. The assumption of "other things being equal" is heroic for a number of reasons, including a formal one. Depending on dispersion, small groups should proportionately intermarry more: their "boundaries" are larger in comparison with their "areas". In this appendix some of the assimilation hypotheses that have been found useful in the literature are listed.

To begin with, let us take, somewhat arbitrarily, equality in numbers between the singles and the multiples as the dividing line: if for any ethnic origin, multiples are greater than singles, then we call them exogamous gainers; if less, they are endogamous losers. For the 59 ethnic groups chosen for the exercise in the five geographic areas in tables 1, 2

and 3, we have the following numbers of endogamous losers in terms of ethnic groups:

Canada 35, Quebec 41, Ontario 34, Manitoba 30, Alberta 25.

Ceteris paribus, what these numbers suggest is that as we move westwards the exogamy becomes greater, more and more ethnic groups go outside their own members for marriage.

Later in section 5, we will show that to get the above threshold of 100, the given ethnic group need to intermarry one-third of its members, perhaps an unduly relaxed requirement.

If we wish to go beyond mere numbers of ethnic groups, proportionate changes need be considered. Obviously, an ethnic group with multiples equal to 105 per cent of its singles is very different from one with 500 per cent. The Irish and the Scottish seem to beat everybody; they have been here longest, except for the French.

A perusal of the varying ratios of multiples to singles in tables 1, 2, and 3 provokes a number of speculative thoughts. The British are not monolithic. The English behave very differently from the Irish, the Scottish and the Welsh. They go out to others to marry to an extent four and five times less than the Irish, the Scottish, and the Welsh. On the face of it, the finding would suggest consistency with two of the hypotheses suggested in the appendix, namely (i) and (iv), though the Irish and the Scottish are not exactly small groups.

The French are heavily endogamous at the national level (33) and extremelly so in Quebec (6!!!), but are exogamous in Ontario (162),

TABLE 1. Selected ethnic origins showing single and multiple origins
Canada 1986

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Selected Ethnic Origins	Single Origins	Multiple Origins	(3) as % of (2)	Selected Ethnic Origins	Single Origins	Multiple Origins	(7) as % of (6)
English	4,742,040	4,561,910	96	Greek	143,780	33,530	23
Irish	699,685	2,922,605	418	Italian	709,585	297,325	42
Scottish	865,450	3,052,606	353	Maltese	15,345	8,925	58
Welsh	23,395	126,890	542	Portuguese	199,595	37,590	19
French	6,087,310	2,027,945	33	Spanish	57,125	56,045	98
Austrian	24,900	49,745	200	Jewish	245,860	97,650	40
Belgian	28,395	46,395	163	Armenian	22,525	4,865	22
Dutch (Netherlands)	351,765	530,170	151	Iranian	13,325	2,420	18
German	896,715	1,570,340	175	Arab, n.i.e.	27,275	10,230	38
Swiss	19,135	41,145	215	Egyptian	11,580	4,135	36
Finnish	40,566	50,775	125	Lebanese	29,345	15,685	53
Danish	39,950	79,105	198	East Indian n.i.e.	220,630	40,810	18
Icelandic	14,470	39,285	271	Pakistani, n.i.e.	24,880	6,770	27
Norwegian	61,575	182,100	296	Punjabi	10,870	4,680	43
Swedish	43,340	160,535	370	Chinese	360,320	53,720	15
Scandinavian, n.i.e.	12,375	19,440	157	Japanese	40,240	14,260	35
Estonian	13,200	7,330	56	Korean	27,680	2,020	7
Latvian	12,620	7,380	58	Filipino	93,285	13,780	15
Lithuanian	14,725	12,225	83	Cambodian	10,370	1,425	18
Czech	20,385	19,255	94	Vietnamese	53,010	9,980	19
Czechoslovakian	18,830	24,605	131	Other Latin/Cen Amer	14,660	6,024	41
Slovak	16,320	11,385	70	Haitian	10,865	6,140	56
Hungarian (Magyar)	97,850	91,145	93	Jamaican	11,210	8,505	76
Polish	222,260	389,840	175	Other West Indian	24,665	15,620	63
Romanian	18,745	32,590	174	Black	170,340	83,770	49
Russian	32,085	71,585	223	Inuit	27,290	9,175	34
Ukrainian	420,210	541,100	129	Metis	59,745	91,865	154
Croatian	35,120	9,055	25	Amerindians	286,230	262,730	92
Macedonian	11,366	5,915	52	Other origins	178,065	2,675	2
Yugoslav, n.i.e.	51,200	33,375	65				

Source for cols. (2), (3), (6) and (7): Appendum to the Daily, Statistics Canada, December 3, 198[illegible] Table 2
n.i.e = not included elsewhere

TABLE 2. Selected ethnic origins showing single and multiple origins Quebec and Ontario 1986

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	QUEBEC			ONTARIO		
Selected Ethnic Origins	Single Origins	Multiple Origins	(3) as % of (2)	Single Origins	Multiple Origins	(6) as % of (5)
English	203,065	222,855	110	2,194,405	2,112,455	96
Irish	74,555	148,930	200	317,810	1,389,875	473
Scottish	41,195	104,520	254	389,775	1,394,510	358
Welsh	555	3,180	573	9,750	48,360	496
French	5,011,500	293,805	6	531,215	859,050	162
Austrian	1,645	2,135	130	10,480	16,885	161
Belgian	6,480	5,430	84	12,175	16,140	133
Dutch (Netherlands)	6,365	11,430	180	171,155	224,555	131
German	26,780	43,510	162	285,160	615,810	216
Swiss	3,425	3,630	106	7,600	15,275	201
Finnish	810	905	112	26,530	27,265	103
Danish	895	1,505	168	10,950	19,585	179
Icelandic	100	320	320	1,270	5,436	428
Norwegian	745	2,230	299	5,170	22,425	434
Swedish	640	2,120	331	7,465	30,620	410
Scandinavian, n.i.e.	165	400	242	1,900	3,290	173
Estonian	655	390	60	10,045	4,185	42
Latvian	905	366	39	9,545	4,060	43
Lithuanian	2,195	1,120	51	10,265	6,665	65
Czech	1,530	890	58	9,070	6,535	72
Czechoslovakian	1,160	1,005	87	8,945	9,070	101
Slovak	1,400	680	49	10,895	7,135	65
Hungarian (Magyar)	8,550	4,390	51	51,255	39,085	76
Polish	18,835	14,810	79	117,580	1,151,510	129
Romanian	3,315	1,990	60	7,385	10,655	144
Russian	1,820	3,355	184	5,780	18,355	318
Ukrainian	12,220	10,190	83	109,705	150,875	138
Croatian	920	270	29	26,755	6,050	23
Macedonian	30	50	167	11,175	5,625	50
Yugoslav, n.i.e.	3,740	1,705	46	32,215	18,485	57
Greek	47,450	5,490	12	80,320	18,185	23

TABLE 2. cont'd

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	QUEBEC			ONTARIO		
Selected Ethnic Origins	Single Origins	Multiple Origins	(3) as % of (2)	Single Origins	Multiple Origins	(6) as % of (5)
Italian	163,880	34,635	21	461,375	167,960	36
Maltese	150	245	163	14,330	7,530	53
Portuguese	29,700	3,680	13	139,225	22,980	17
Spanish	16,605	7,815	47	28,005	24,620	88
Jewish	81,195	17,035	21	127,025	49,510	39
Armenian	10,810	1,700	16	10,750	2,370	22
Iranian	3,205	505	16	5,825	985	17
Arab, n.i.e.	9,190	3,600	39	12,705	4,250	33
Egyptian	6,155	1,840	30	4,195	1,660	40
Lebanese	8,270	3,165	38	11,820	6,695	57
East Indian, n.i.e.	12,120	2,955	24	111,775	23,105	21
Pakistani, n.i.e.	2,750	725	26	14,910	3,975	27
Punjabi	320	190	59	2,860	1,155	40
Chinese	23,205	3,550	15	156,170	24,790	16
Japanese	1,280	615	48	16,155	4,450	28
Korean	1;230	75	6	17,200	1,225	7
Filipino	5,115	925	18	44,195	6,015	14
Cambodian	5,165	615	12	3,160	505	16
Vietnamese	15,865	1,565	10	17,155	4,210	25
Other Latin/Cen. Amer.	5,685	1,150	20	6,135	3,080	50
Haitian	10,455	5,650	54	290	405	140
Jamaican	660	350	53	8,980	6,685	74
Other West Indian	1,515	1,430	94	19,870	11,015	55
Black	36,785	14,610	40	108,710	46,795	43
Inuit	6,470	890	14	675	2,285	339
Metis	5,705	5,740	101	3,720	14,565	392
Amerindian	37,150	26,435	71	51,150	99,555	195
Other origins	25,745	415	2	70,005	1,055	2

Source for cols. (2), (3), (6) and (7): Addendum to The Daily, Statistics Canada, December 3, 1987, table 2.
n.i.e. = note included elsewhere.

TABLE 3. Selected ethnic origins showing single and multiple origins Manitoba and Alberta (1986)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	MANITOBA			ALBERTA		
Selected Ethnic Origins	Single Origins	Multiple Origins	(3) as % of (2)	Single Origins	Multiple Origins	(6) as % of (5)
English	158,190	208,745	132	438,950	567,655	129
Irish	24,235	126,055	520	60,790	352,750	580
Scottish	40,825	150,450	369	88,645	392,420	443
Welsh	1,050	6,360	606	3,780	22,135	586
French	55,605	89,660	161	77,430	218,185	282
Austrian	1,665	3,490	210	3,165	9,165	290
Belgian	4,255	7,075	166	1,755	5,945	339
Dutch (Netherlands)	27,875	29,500	106	55,920	83,330	149
German	96,165	88,815	92	182,870	297,950	163
Swiss	595	1,725	280	2,475	8,220	332
Finnish	720	1,550	215	2,625	6,015	229
Danish	1,395	3,845	276	11,610	23,680	204
Icelandic	6,980	13,565	194	1,650	6,020	365
Norwegian	2,515	9,025	359	18,395	57,560	313
Swedish	3,335	12,455	373	10,995	43,495	396
Scandinavian, n.i.e.	615	1,140	185	3,875	6,140	158
Estonian	55	90	164	580	900	155
Latvian	400	635	159	545	890	163
Lithuanian	345	415	120	840	1,655	197
Czech	1,110	1,110	99	3,150	4,050	130
Czechslovakian	900	1,545	172	3,445	5,680	165
Slovak	760	455	60	1,685	1,580	94
Hungarian (Magyar)	3,225	3,660	113	12,780	16,065	126
Polish	22,015	46,530	211	28,500	76,720	269
Romanian	640	1,715	268	2,795	6,920	248
Russian	1,755	4,545	259	4,185	15,185	363
Ukrainian	79,940	79,385	98	106,760	132,210	124
Croatian	670	245	37	1,990	730	37
Macedonian	0	0	--	105	120	114
Yugoslav, n.i.e.	1,195	1,045	87	4,525	3,975	88

TABLE 3 cont'd.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	MANITOBA			ALBERTA		
Selected Ethnic Origins	Single Origins	Multiple Origins	(3) as % of (2)	Single Origins	Multiple Origins	(6) as % of (5)
Italian	8,230	6,970	85	23,635	26,395	112
Maltese	100	60	60	175	255	146
Portuguese	7,340	1,085	15	6,285	2,505	40
Spanish	1,180	1,825	155	5,285	5,975	113
Jewish	13,875	4,400	32	7,945	7,160	90
Armenian	75	75	100	105	195	186
Iranian	180	90	50	800	200	25
Arab, n.i.e.	275	190	69	3,145	1,030	33
Egyptian	115	25	22	640	305	48
Lebanese	170	390	229	5,010	1,425	28
East Indian, n.i.e.	6,000	1,250	21	24,635	3,780	15
Pakistani, n.i.e.	625	265	42	3,245	750	23
Punjabi	500	145	29	1,160	375	32
Chinese	8,730	2,010	23	49,210	7,550	15
Japanese	1,050	495	47	5,300	2,690	51
Korean	565	35	6	3,385	300	9
Filipino	15,815	1,525	10	10,265	1,500	15
Cambodian	315	15	5	1,025	160	16
Vietnamese	2,060	455	22	9,625	2,015	21
Other Latin/Cen. Amer.	520	155	22	1,240	700	56
Haitian	40	10	25	35	45	129
Jamaican	280	105	338	875	715	82
Other West Indian	905	520	57	1,395	1,280	92
Black	3,665	2,525	69	7,235	6,205	86
Inuit	185	515	278	295	830	281
Metis	14,270	19,015	133	16,880	23,250	138
Amerindian	40,965	14,990	37	34,490	34,475	100
Other origins	12,520	110	1	25,815	480	2

Source for cols. (2), (3), (6) and (7): Addendum to The Daily, Statistics Canada, December 5, 487, table 2.
n.i.e. = not included elsewhere.

Manitoba (161) and even more so in Alberta (282), supporting hypotheses (i) and (iii), but not (ii).

The "older" or traditional immigrants in table 1 from Austrians to Scandinavians, and from Polish to Ukrainian have high exogamy. Small groups tend to be endogamous losers (they intermarry less) contrary to hypothesis (ii) in the appendix, because apparently hypothesis (i) is more influential or more realistic. The "younger" groups are the more recent immigrants with little exogamy. The same picture is repeated with few exceptions due to small numbers at the four provincial levels in tables 2 and 3. The three Baltic ethnicities (Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians) keep to themselves at the national level (forty years after coming to Canada?), in Quebec and in Ontario, but are outgoing in Manitoba and Alberta. It is not clear why hypothesis (i) from the appendix would not work throughout, because these three groups are small whatever the geographic dimension. Could it be that it is the nature of the host society that affects intermarriage (open in Manitoba and Alberta, closed in Quebec and Ontario?), more than the features of the ethnic group concerned. Hypotheses (iii), (v) and (vi) cannot be tested until relevant data become available.

On continuing perusal of table 1 three groups of ethnicities drew attention and, if it is not too fanciful, we arranged their percentages as follows:

	the cosmopolitan		the inward looking		
Czechoslovakian	131	Czech	94	70	Slovak
Yugoslavian	65	Macdenoian	52	26	Croatian*
Metis	154	Amerindian	92	34	Inuit

The Croatian* according to table 4 had the rare experience of gains in singles (recent immigration?), which dulls some of the excitement created by the tabular composition above.

This paper is being written in the absence of cross-classifying variables. Once such variables become available, it might be possible to arrive at a typology of differential pace and nature of the adoption of multiethnicities among ethnic groups in Canada. Figure 1 is an attempt at such a typology using endogamy-exogamy and early-recent period of immigration. Judging from the strange bed-fellows in the cells of the figure, a 2 by 2 classification, that occurred to us, may not be sufficient for the study of multiethnicities. The typology might, in turn, lead to evolution of a theory of differential change into multiethnicities. Without such a typology one would not know where and how to begin: the higher the education the faster the transformation? Does higher education increase the probability of intermarriage similarly to widening employing opportunities and increasing long-distance migration? Or is it that high education provides a cultural base sufficiently strong for the preservation of language and culture, almost independent of the endogamy-exogamy syndrome?

At the provincial level (tables 2 and 3) the numbers are getting smaller, but the Czechoslovakian line behaves the same in the four

FIGURE 1. Endogamy, exogamy, time of immigration

	IMMIGRATION	
	Early	Recent
ENDOGAMY	English	Portuguese Spanish Chinese
	Amerindian Inuit	Iranian Korean
	French	Croatians Japanese Greek
EXOGAMY	Scottish Irish Welsh Metis Armenian	Czechoslovakian Yugoslavian

provinces as at the national level. Yugoslavians behave anarchistically, but their numbers are quite small. The three native groups behave as they do at the national level, unless the numbers in any one province are small.

5. The cost of multiethnicity in terms of single origins

Multiethnicities are created and reported at the expense of single ethnicities. The actual procedure is of some significance for the understanding of the new data. It is described in this section.

The exogamous gains discussed in section 3 above are double gains in comparison with the single origins customarily reported under the previous Canadian definition. Both ethnicities in an intermarriage gain a "one" with each offspring (in the current Canadian practice of census analysis). If each and every Canadian reported no more than the lowest multiple, that is two ethnic origins, then the number of multiples would be equal to 50 million for a country of 25 million people. In such a case all singles would have disappeared altogether. We are far from this state, but tables 4 through 8 show the losses experienced by singles between 1971-81, between 1971-86 and jointly between 1981-86. Tables 4 through 8 contain a different arrangement of ethnic groups than Tables 1 through 3. For table 4 through 8 the given ethnic group had to be reported in all three censuses. For tables 1 through 3 it only had to have a minimum number of 10,000 singles reported in 1986.

Out of the ethnic groups selected for the exercise at the national level in table 4, we have three ethnic groups par excellence endogamous losers (shown here as gainers in singles), Portuguese, Spanish, Chinese.

TABLE 4. Selected ethnic origins according to single origins
Intercensal changes 1971-81, 1981-86, 1971-86 Canada

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
				Percentage change		
Origin	1971	1981	1986	81-71	86-81	86-71
British	9624115	9674250	8332725	0.52	-34.54	-34.20
French	6180120	6439100	6093160	4.19	-5.37	-1.41
Austrian	42120	40630	24900	-3.54	-38.72	-40.88
Belgian	51135	42270	28395	-17.34	-32.82	-44.47
Dutch	425945	408235	351765	-4.16	-13.83	-17.42
German	1317200	1142365	896720	-13.27	-21.50	-31.92
Finnish	59215	52315	40565	-11.65	-22.46	-31.50
Estonian	18810	15915	13200	-15.39	-17.06	-29.82
Latvian	18810	16145	12615	-14.17	-21.86	-32.93
Lithuanian	24535	18240	14725	-25.66	-19.27	-39.98
Hungarian	131890	116395	97850	-11.75	-15.93	-25.81
Polish	316425	254485	222260	-19.57	-12.66	-29.76
Romanian	27375	22485	18745	-17.86	-16.63	-31.53
Russian	64475	49430	32080	-23.33	-35.10	-50.24
Ukrainian	580660	529615	420210	-8.78	-20.66	-27.63
Croatian	23380	34765	35115	48.70	1.01	50.19
Yugoslavian	67295	64835	51205	-3.66	-21.02	-23.91
Greek	124475	154360	143780	24.01	-6.85	15.51
Italian	730820	747970	709590	2.35	-5.13	-2.90
Portuguese	96875	188105	199595	94.17	6.11	106.03
Spanish	27515	53540	57125	94.58	6.70	107.61
Jewish	296945	264020	254855	-11.09	-3.47	-14.17
Chinese	118815	289245	360320	143.44	24.57	203.26
Japanese	37260	40995	40245	10.02	-1.83	8.01
Czecho-Slovak	81870	67700	55535	-17.31	-17.97	-32.17
Slovenian	7305	6395	5890	-12.46	-7.90	-19.37
Scandinavian	384790	282795	171715	-26.51	-39.28	-55.37
Sum	20880175	21016600	16684885	0.65	-20.62	-20.10

TABLE 5. Selected ethnic origins according to single origins
Intercensal changes 1971-81, 1981-86, 1971-86 Quebec

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
				Percentage change		
Origin	1971	1981	1986	81-71	86-81	86-71
British	640045	487385	319550	-23.85	-34.44	-50.07
French	4759350	5105670	5015565	7.28	-1.76	5.38
Austrian	2500	2275	1645	-9.00	-27.69	-34.20
Belgian	8220	6465	6485	-21.35	0.31	-21.11
Dutch	12590	8055	6365	-36.02	-20.98	-49.44
German	53870	33770	26780	-37.31	-20.70	-50.29
Finnish	1865	1140	810	-38.87	-28.95	-56.57
Estonian	1440	745	655	-48.26	-12.08	-54.51
Latvian	1415	1170	905	-17.31	-22.65	-36.04
Lithuanian	3990	2745	2195	-31.20	-20.04	-44.99
Hungarian	12570	9750	8545	-22.43	-12.36	-32.02
Polish	23970	19755	18835	-17.58	-4.66	-21.42
Romanian	2920	2785	3315	20.04	19.03	42.89
Russian	4060	2945	1815	-27.46	-38.37	-55.30
Ukrainian	20325	14640	12225	-27.97	-16.50	-39.85
Croatian	1100	1550	920	40.91	-40.65	-16.36
Yugoslavian	4950	4365	3735	-11.82	-14.43	-24.55
Greek	42870	49420	47450	15.28	-3.99	10.68
Italian	169655	163735	163880	-3.49	0.09	-3.40
Portuguese	16555	27370	29700	65.33	8.51	79.40
Spanish	10825	15460	16605	42.82	7.41	53.39
Jewish	115990	90360	81190	-22.10	-10.15	-30.00
Chinese	11905	19260	23205	61.78	20.48	94.92
Japanese	1745	1395	1285	-20.06	-7.89	-26.36
Czecho-Slovak	6725	4845	4085	-27.96	-15.69	-39.26
Slovenian	425	260	245	-38.82	-5.77	-42.35
Scandinavian	8820	4225	2540	-52.10	-39.88	-71.20
Sum	5931285	6077315	5797990	2.46	-4.60	-2.25

TABLE 6. Selected ethnic origins according to single origins
Intercensal changes 1971-81, 1981-86, 1971-86 Ontario

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
				Percentage change		
Origin	1971	1981	1986	81-71	86-81	86-71
British	4576010	4487800	2912830	-1.93	-35.09	-36.35
French	737360	652905	531580	-11.45	-18.58	-27.91
Austrian	15765	15145	10475	-3.93	-30.84	-33.56
Belgian	19955	17910	12180	-10.25	-31.99	-38.96
Dutch	206940	191125	171150	-7.64	-10.45	-17.29
German	475320	373390	285155	-21.44	-23.63	-40.01
Finnish	38515	33400	26530	-13.28	-20.57	-31.12
Estonian	13730	11800	10045	-14.06	-14.87	-26.84
Latvian	13045	11735	9550	-10.04	-18.62	-26.79
Lithuanian	15365	12070	10265	-21.44	-14.95	-33.19
Hungarian	65695	59140	51255	-9.98	-13.33	-21.98
Polish	144415	122945	117575	-14.87	-4.37	-18.59
Romanian	9255	8170	7385	-11.72	-9.61	-20.21
Russian	12580	8715	5780	-30.72	-33.68	-54.05
Ukrainian	159880	133995	109705	-16.19	-18.13	-31.38
Croatian	16860	24640	26760	46.14	8.60	58.72
Yugoslavian	42085	41435	32215	-1.54	-22.25	-23.45
Greek	67025	85955	80320	28.24	-6.56	19.84
Italian	463095	487310	361375	5.23	-5.32	-0.37
Portuguese	63145	129000	139220	104.29	7.92	120.48
Spanish	10330	25185	28800	143.80	11.18	171.06
Jewish	135195	131320	127030	-2.87	-3.27	-6.04
Chinese	39325	118640	156170	201.69	31.63	297.13
Japanese	15600	16685	16150	6.96	-3.21	3.53
Czecho-Slovak	40770	33025	28910	19.00	-12.46	-29.09
Slovenian	5635	5040	4720	10.56	-6.35	-16.24
Scandinavian	60225	40335	26755	33.03	-33.67	-55.57
Sum	7402895	7238480	5372330	-2.23	-25.79	-27.43

TABLE 7. Selected ethnic origins according to single origins
Intercensal changes 1971-81, 1981-86, 1971-86 Manitoba

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
				Percentage change		
Origin	1971	1981	1986	81-71	86-81	86-71
British	414125	373995	224375	-9.69	-40.01	-45.82
French	86510	74045	55720	-14.41	-24.75	-35.59
Austrian	3200	3155	1665	-1.41	-47.23	-47.97
Belgian	9055	6455	4255	-28.71	-34.08	-53.01
Dutch	35300	33875	27875	-4.04	-17.71	-21.03
German	123065	108140	96160	-12.13	-11.08	-21.86
Finnish	1450	1060	720	-26.90	-32.08	-50.34
Estonian	185	180	55	-2.70	-69.44	-70.27
Latvian	840	580	400	-30.95	-31.03	-52.38
Lithuanian	820	515	340	-37.20	-33.98	-58.54
Hungarian	5405	4160	3230	-23.03	-22.36	-40.24
Polish	42705	28445	22015	-33.39	-22.61	-48.45
Romanian	1375	900	640	-34.55	-28.89	-53.45
Russian	4040	3765	1755	-6.81	-53.39	-56.56
Ukrainian	114410	99795	79940	-12.77	-19.90	-30.13
Croatian	610	685	665	12.30	-2.92	9.02
Yugoslavian	1990	2060	1195	3.52	-41.99	-39.95
Greek	2095	2385	2025	13.84	-15.09	-3.34
Italian	10445	9600	8230	-8.09	-14.27	-21.21
Portuguese	3815	7930	7335	105.24	-6.32	92.27
Spanish	640	1470	1180	129.69	-19.73	84.38
Jewish	20010	14950	13870	-25.29	-7.22	-30.68
Chinese	3430	7065	8730	105.98	23.57	154.52
Japanese	1335	1300	1055	-2.62	-18.85	-20.97
Czecho-Slovak	4760	3590	2770	-24.58	-22.84	-41.81
Slovenian	360	305	120	-15.28	-60.66	-66.67
Scandinavian	35105	25175	14835	-28.29	-41.07	-57.74
Sum	891975	790305	566320	-11.40	-28.34	-36.51

TABLE 8. Selected ethnic origins according to single origins
Intercensal changes 1971-81, 1981-86, 1971-86 Alberta

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
				Percentage change		
Origin	1971	1981	1986	81-71	86-81	86-71
British	761665	962785	592345	26.41	-38.48	-22.23
French	94665	111865	77585	18.17	-30.64	-18.04
Austrian	6310	6405	3170	1.51	-50.51	-49.76
Belgian	4265	4125	1755	-3.28	-57.45	-58.85
Dutch	58565	69090	55920	11.14	-14.09	-4.52
German	231005	233180	182870	0.94	-21.58	-20.84
Finnish	3590	4130	2625	15.04	-36.44	-26.88
Estonian	845	790	580	-6.51	-26.58	-31.36
Latvian	1010	980	545	-2.97	-44.39	-46.04
Lithuanian	1845	1255	840	-31.98	-33.07	-54.47
Hungarian	16240	15170	12780	-6.59	-15.75	-21.31
Polish	44325	37660	28500	-15.04	-24.32	-35.70
Romanian	4670	3800	2790	-18.63	-26.58	-40.26
Russian	10235	7715	4185	-24.62	-45.76	-59.11
Ukrainian	135510	136710	106760	0.89	-21.91	-21.22
Croatian	1130	2375	1990	110.18	-16.21	76.11
Yugoslavian	5720	5995	4525	4.81	-24.52	-20.89
Greek	3250	4815	4030	48.15	-16.30	24.00
Italian	24805	26610	23635	7.28	-11.18	-4.72
Portuguese	2385	6125	6280	156.81	2.53	163.31
Spanish	1305	4945	5280	278.93	6.77	304.60
Jewish	7320	9460	7945	29.23	-16.01	8.54
Chinese	12905	36770	49210	184.93	33.83	281.33
Japanese	4460	5230	5295	17.26	1.24	18.72
Czecho-Slovak	12970	11195	8235	-13.69	-26.44	-36.51
Slovenian	290	285	410	-1.72	43.86	41.38
Scandinavian	98425	78565	46525	-20.18	-40.78	-52.73
Sum	1451205	1705465	1190085	11.75	-30.22	-18.00

The Croatians, the Japanese and the Greek show much smaller gains in singles, that is endogamous losses. These gains in singles were all experienced in 1971-81, rather than 1981-86, as if the inexorable progress of exogamy took off in 1981-86 even in the case of the hitherto stubborn endogamists. All other ethnic groups show losses in singles. These losses in singles must have meant multiple counterpart gains; in the previous nomenclature suggested in section 3 they were described as endogamous gainers; once big enough, the concerned ethnic groups presumably become exogamous gainers above the 100 threshold suggested for the discussion of table 1 through 3.

In the previous definition to become an exogamous gainer an ethnic group had to have at least as many multiples as reported singles. For each single respondent lost while becoming a multiple, through the outside intermarriage of the father, such an ethnic group, on the assumption of ceteris paribus, gained a multiple, another multiple having gone to another, intermarrying ethnic group. So, the ethnic group needs to lose only 33 per cent singles who on becoming multiples are equal to half the remaining 67 per cent singles. The other half of the remaining 67 per cent, gained ceteris paribus another multiple from other singles. The two multiples become together equal to 67 per cent of the singles in the given ethnicity. Moving in due course above the two multiples (or 67 per cent in singles) gives the ethnic group the status of exogamous gainers. Thus, to become an exogamous gainer an ethnic group needs to lose just slightly more than 33 per cent of its singles. In tables 4 through 8 we see that the encouragement to report multiethnicities in 1981 was still slight. However, due to stronger encouragement in 1986, in the one quinquennial

period of 1981-1986, the overall losses in single ethnicities were already considerable with 21% for Canada, 26% for Ontario, 28% for Manitoba and 30% for Alberta. In short, and with the exception of the 5% in Quebec, Canada is already on its way through intermarriages to reaching the indicator of 100 in the realm of multiethnicities.

Let us compare tables 1, 2 and 3 with tables 4 through 8 and see whether the two lots of exogamous gainers are the same. Ontario in table 6 behaves by and large like the whole country in table 4, but it is useful to note some differences in detail. The French are single endogamous losers like "everybody else", though they were just about holding their own at the national level in table 4. Croatians gain about the same as in Canada, as do Greeks, Portuguese, Spanish, Chinese and Japanese.

Manitoba in table 7 and Alberta in table 8 have features of their own. In Manitoba, with the single exception of the Germans, every ethnicity loses more (or gains less) than it did in Canada as a whole. In the nomenclature of section 3 these are the actual or potential exogamous gainers. In Alberta out of the 27 ethnic groups available, as many as 16 have losses smaller (or gains greater) than at the national level. Apparently Manitobans intermarry with greater enthusiasm than Albertans. Or is it that the ethnic groups in Alberta had all greater in-migration and immigration? Multiethnicities, like other measures in social sciences require the "holding constant" or standardization of such variables to increase comparability (to compare like with like).

6. The particular case of Quebec

In the previous section we have already indicated that Quebec uses multiethnicities less sensationally than other parts of Canada. In this section we attempt to see to what extent multiethnicities in Quebec can be employed usefully.

In table 5 for Quebec, the French are neutral as they were at the national level in table 4: they do not intermarry to become exogamous gainers, and they do not gain by immigration to become endogamous losers. The gains in singles of the nationally prominent groups are much more modest in Quebec (the Portuguese, etc.). Not much is happening in Quebec in terms of interethnic exchanges. On the face of things, it looks as if Quebec managed to preserve its XIX century ethnic balance.

There are, however, important, qualitative changes taking place within the society. Some of the immigrants are from the third world and as such more visible. Internal migration contributes to linguistic polarization. On balance, internal migration benefits francophones (Lachapelle 1987a:121), but insufficiently (ibid. 122) to make up the losses through linguistic transfers. Well documented language transfers take place between censuses. These are of no concern to this paper, but being more difficult in themselves than ethnic transfers, they make ethnic transfers, which are of interest to this paper, more plausible as an explanatory factor (Lachapelle 1988a).

Due to past high fertility Quebecers still have an age distribution favourable to fertility, hence for a while their disappearance from this continent will be slowed down (Lachapelle 1987b:5; Lachapelle & Henripin 1980, 1982; Termote & Gauvreau 1988). Furthermore, what the Quebecers

lose linguistically towards the English, they make up with gains from third languages (Lachapelle 1987b:6), but the fertility losses they are not making up (Lachapelle 1988b).

It is apparent from the French original of chapter 23 by Choiniere and Robitaille that our Quebec colleagues are conscious of the considerable influence of inter-ethnic switches, more elegantly called in chapter 23 "ethnic mobility." This feature of the French ethnic group has been reported upon in the past (e.g., Henripin 1974; see also the numerous writings of Charles Castonguay on this topic, e.g., 1985).

Should such ethnic mobility be taking place with any magnitude, it will affect the reported singles as losses in one case and gains in the other, without bringing in the multiples. This is quite apart from the fact that persons reporting a given ethnicity do not necessarily identify with that ethnicity.[5] The low proportion of the French multiples would suggest that "they" (the erstwhile French singles), do not become French multiples, but singles of another ethnic group, presumably English.[6] Such transfers, from ethnicity to ethnicity, on common sense grounds must be "easier" for the individual concerned than transfers from one mother tongue to another; yet the latter have been reported upon the basis of detailed analysis (e.g., Lachapelle 1988a: table 7; Henripin 1985).

7. Some ambitious measurement in the future

An alternative title to this section could be "A solution to the fact that a single is not equal to a multiple". That they are not, has already been shown in section 3. Here we stop over the fact that Statistics Canada added up as "one" each reported multiethnicity, irrespective of the

number reported by a respondent. We would like to propose that the weight of "one" is heavy and illogical, though the obvious and immediate way out in this new situation. It would be more appropriate to give weights of 0.5 to each ethnicity when two are reported, 0.333 to each of three, 0.25 to each of four, and so on. More generally, and algebraically, the proposed weighting is as follows:

$$w_{ie} = 1/k \qquad (1)$$

where w_{ie} is the weight given to an individual respondent i for each of the multiethnicities e reported by him/her;

k is the number of multiethnicities reported by a given respondent i.

This suggestion is not a complete solution to the problem of weights, because 0.333 is illogical in itself for three reported ethnicities. It should be some such combination as 0.5, 0.25 and 0.25, if that type of exercise were practical for a census questionnaire. Imposing 0.333 does violence to reality, but even 0.5 with two ethnicities could be untrue. Peter Lougheed, the ex-premier of Alberta liked to boast that he is part-Metis, the indiscretion having been committed presumably in the distant past, say, four generations ago, not among his immediate parents. Then, if he reported two ethnicities, the true weight would be 1/16 and 15/16. Still, the suggested weights of 0.5 and 0.5 are a truer reflection of reality than "one" and "one".[7]

We know that 6,986,345 respondents gave multiple ethnicities for a grand total of 17,920,235 multiethnicities. To arrive at the latter total, we have added up all the 59 ethnic groups appearing in tables 1 through 3. The results have been compared with the total singles in each area:

$$M_s = \frac{\Sigma M_{a_e}}{\Sigma S_{a_e}} \cdot 100 \qquad (2)$$

where M_s is the ratio of all multiples reported in the given area a by all respondents to the total of singles reported by all respondents in the same area

M_{a_e} are multiples reported in the given area for ethnicity e, each multiple counted as "one"

S_{a_e} are singles reported in the given area for ethnicity e.

For Canada, the provinces and territories the ratios of multiples to singles are shown in col (2) of table 9. These averages are interesting in themselves and can be treated as an index of intermarriage called "longevity index of intermarriage." The reason why we use the word "longevity" in the description of the index, is that the greater the reported admixture, the longer into the past must it have been taking place.

Another attempt to come to grips with these new data is made in col (3) of table 9. For Canada, each province and each territory a ratio has been calculated:

$$M_a \text{ per } R = M_a/(P_a - S_a) \qquad (3)$$

where M_a stands for multiples in the given area a

R_a stands for respondent

P_a stands for population size of the given area a

S^a stands for singles in the given area a

Thus, $(P_a - S_a)$ equals the number of respondents in the given province/ territory reporting multiples and the ratio gives the number of

TABLE 9. Average multiple ethnicities Canada, provinces and territories, 1986

	Multiple ethnicities	
	As %-age of single ethnicities[1]	Reported by an average respondent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Canada	99.4	2.565
Newfoundland	46.2	2.316
Prince Edward Island	169.2	2.469
Nova Scotia	155.4	2.537
New Brunswick	97.8	2.497
Quebec	17.2	2.330
Ontario	131.1	2.559
Manitoba	139.9	2.594
Saskatchewan	180.1	2.633
British Columbia	163.1	2.634
Yukon	220.0	2.694
Northwest Territories	78.1	2.593

[1] Total reported multiple ethnicities as a %-age of total reported single ethnicities.

multiples reported by an average respondent reporting multiples. It is not possible to calculate these ratios for ethnic groups at the present stage of our understanding of these data because we do not have P_{ae}, population size in area a for ethnic origin e.

The small differences among provinces and territories will probably surprise colleagues working in the area. Quebec has, as it should, a low average (2.330), but it is second lowest to Newfoundland (2.316), understandable with its ethnic monolithicity. Do we stop to notice the difference between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? Their ethnic groups were there for about the same stretch of time, their absolute population sizes are about the same, their Englishness is about the same. Could the Acadians be responsible for the slightly lower figure in the case of New Brunswick? From Ontario westward everything is over, and well over, two and a half. Intermarriage has only begun; for individual problems on the way see Harding & Riley 1986.

8. Data requirements for ideal measurements of multiethnicity

For purposes of measuring the immediate cause of multiethnicity which is intermarriage, one would like to hold constant all intervening variables. Demographically, we would like all ethnic groups to have the same fertility and the same mortality, and consequently the same age distribution. Ecologically, we would like them to be dispersed with the same density, though if they were not the same population size some trade off could be negotiated with regard to size to make up for differences in density and distribution. Economically, we would like them to be of similar economic status, similar education, and similar cultural

endowments. Finally, we would like each ethnic group to receive similar proportionate injections of immigrants possibly with similar immigration points acquired.

With ethnic groups that similar, any differences in multiethnicity and in losses of singles would then be a purely ethnic phenomenon. Frankly, one would not expect many differences among ethnic groups in such circumstances, though there could be still the influence of origin, colour, race, religion, language, all variables identified customarily with ethnicity.

The above is a tall order: the recency and size of immigration streams and influence can probably be assessed by impecunious academicians. The more ambitious qualifications can probably be assessed only by those with the unlimited power of the Canadian taxpayer behind them with her bottomless purse.

9. Multiculturalism and the emerging multiethnicity

Multiculturalism and exogamy do not march together. There are some brides in love who learn the language of the bridegroom and of his family, and vice versa, but numerically these do not amount to much. By and large exogamy implies eventual disappearance of a given ethnic origin, sometimes both origins and molding into a third party (the melting pot). Complete exogamy means complete disappearance of multiculturalism, including most types of pluralism.

In this perspective, multiculturalism is a temporary and passing phenomenon. Multiethnicities thanks to the change in the Canadian definition provide a means of measuring its demise. By the time

respondents report, say, eight ethnic origins and the value of each will be computed as .125, multiculturalism will be gone.

ENDNOTES

1. With a strict application of the Canadian definition there was no space for Metis. If fathered by a German or Frenchman with an Amerindian mother the Metis offspring ought to be classified as German or French. If fathered by an Amerindian male with a European mother, the offspring ought to have been recorded as Amerindian. It required illogical departures from the Canadian definition to make space on the questionnaire for Metis, as was the case in 1941. At the time they were still called half-bloods; in itself probably an indication of the persistence of colour consciousness among the Anglo-Saxons, and possibly a reason why there are few reported Metis among the French

2. "Mr Fertility of the world", Norman Ryder, counts interest in the Canadian definition of ethnicity among his minor pursuits (Ryder 1988). Briefly, for 36 years Ryder thought it should be destroyed. He was speechless for quite a while when he learned of the 1986 introduction of multiethnicity.

3. Statisticians were not prepared for this development. Lachapelle (1988a) reports that for the purposes of tabulations multiple answers were distributed proportionately over single answers, a procedure adequate as an immediate measure with the small numbers of 1981, but obviously begging for a more thorough solution in the long run. The multiple answers were preserved on the family/household file of the public use sample tape (PUST) and are available for analysis (see, e.g., Kalbach & Richard 1985).

4. Not only do not census-takers engage in social engineering, but they have to foresee data requirements arising out of new legislation and the introduction of new public policies. There is a federal act on fairness in employment, specifically aiming at the protection of four groups: disabled, women, visible minorities and aboriginal peoples. Discrimination and fairness can be ascertained objectively only when data are collected for the denominator. And if the new need collides with another cherished requirement, that of confidentiality protection, who wins?

5. This point is often stressed by Warren E Kalbach (e.g., 1975, Kalbach & Richard 1985).

6. Obviously, shifters diminish their original singles and increase the receiving singles; consequently, the shifters lower for the losing ethnicity the proportions of multiples required to qualify for the status of exogamous gainers (just like the French) and increases it for the gaining ethnicity to qualify for the status of endogamous losers (just like the English).

7. In the eyes of the authors of the proposed arrangement, a Metis out of union of Amerindian and, say, English should have weights 0.5 and 0.5. The offspring then marrying again with an English person should have weights of 0.25 for the Indian part and 0.75 for the English parts. This is not suggested as a serious census exercise, but it is to point out the logical difficulty with the ethnic origin of multiples called "Metis" given in our source, a situation that could have arisen only due to the inherent racism in an Anglo society, where a person once crossbred, remains Metis for ever. In other

societies, less fragile, a Metis would soon pass out of the Indian connection and into the general society.

REFERENCES

Basavarajappa, KG and SS Halli
1986 "Fertility levels of Asian Indians in Canada" Chapter 10 (pp. 136-147) in From India to Canada. Ed. by S Chandrasekhar. La Jolla, California: A Population Review Book, 217 pp. ISBN 0-9609080-2-1.

Beaujot, Roderic
1979 "A demographic view on Canadian language policy." Canadian Public Policy/Analyse politique 5:16-29, ISSN 0317-0861.

Beaujot, Roderic
1982 "The decline of official language minorities in Quebec and English Canada." Canadian Journal of Sociology 7(4):367-389.

Castonguay, Charles
1977 "La mobilite ethnique au Canada". Recherches Sociographiques 18(3):431-450.

Castonguay, Charles
1979 "Exogamie et anglicisation chez les minorites canadiennes-francaises". Revue canadienne de sociologie et d'anthropologie 16(1):21-31.

Castonguay, Charles
1985 "Transferts et semi-transfers linguistiques au Quebec d'apres recensement de 1981." Cahiers quebecois de demographie 14(1):59-85, April 1985.

Goldstein, Jay and Alexander Segall
1985 "Ethnic intermarriage and ethnic identity". Canadian Ethnic Studies 17(3):60-90.

Gordon, Milton
1964 Assimilation in American life. New York: Oxford University Press, 276 pp.

Harding, Edith and Philip Riley
1986 The bilingual family. A handbook for parents. Cambridge University Press, 165 pp.

Henripin, Jacques
1974 Immigration and language imbalance. A report commissioned by the Canadian Immigration and Population Study. Ottawa, Ontario: Manpower and Immigration, vii + 41 pp.

Henripin, Jacques
1985 "Les Quebecoises dont la langue est flottante et la mobilite linguistique". Cahiers quebecois de demographie 14(1):87-99.

Innis, Hugh R
1973 Bilingualism & biculturalism. An abridged version of the Royal Commission Report. Toronto, Ontario: McClelland and Stewart Limited, vi + 186 pp.

Kalbach, Warren E
1975 "Demographic aspects of ethnic identity and assimilation". Pp. 139-146 in Sounds Canadian: languages and cultures in multi-ethnic society. Edited by Paul Migus. Vol. 4 in Canadian Ethnic Studies Association series. Toronto, Canada: Peter Martin Associates Limited, 261 pp. ISBN 0-8878-108-X.

Kalbach, Warren E
1983 "Propensities for intermarriage in Canada as reflected in the ethnic origin of husbands and wives, 1961-1971" in Marriage and divorce in Canada. Ed. by K. Ishwaran. Toronto: Addison-Wesley.

Kalbach, Warren E and Madeline A Richard
1985 Multiple origins and ethnic exogamy: clues to assimilation and socio-economic integration of families in the 1981 census of Canada. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, University of Montreal, May 1985.

Lachapelle, Rejean
1987a "The strengthening of majority positions: recent developments in the language situation". Pp. 109-125 in Report on the demographic situation in Canada 1986 by Jean Dumas. Ottawa, Ontario: Minister of Supply and Services, xiii + 138 pp. ISSN 0715-9293.

Lachapelle, Rejean
1987b L'avenir demographique du Canada et les groupes linguistiques. Discussion paper on the Demographic Review, 87.A.8. Studies in Social Policy. Ottawa, Ontario: The Institute for Research on Public Policy, 21 pp.

Lachapelle, Rejean
1988a L'immigration et le caractere ethnolinguistique du Canada et du Quebec. Documents de recherche, Nr 15. Ottawa, Ontario: Direction des etudes analytiques, Statistique Canada, 33 pp.

Lachapelle, Rejean
1988b "Changes in fertility among Canada's linguistic groups". Canadian Social Trends 10:2-8, Autumn 1988. ISSN 0831-5698.

Lachapelle, Rejean & Jacques Henripin
1980 La situation demolinguistique au Canada: evolution passee et prospective. Montreal: L'institut de recherches politiques, xxxii + 391 pp. ISBN 0-920380-26-3.

Lachapelle, Rejean & Jacques Henripin
1982 The demoglinguistic situation in Canada: past trends and future prospects. Translated by Diedre A. Mark. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy, xivi + 387 pp. ISBN 0-920380-42-5.

Mangalam, J J
1986 "Post-immigration adjustment of Indian's immigrants in Canada: a case study". Chapter 7 (pp 95-112) in From India to Canada. Ed by S Chandrasekhar. La Jolla, California: A Population Review Book, 217 pp. ISBN 0-9609080-2-1.

Ryder, Norman
1989 A paper submitted to the Committee on Demographic Statistics and Studies, Advisory to the Chief Statistician of Canada.

SSC
1988 "Statistics in the capitals: News from Statistics Canada". Bulletin Liaison 2(2):36, Winter 1988. Ottawa, Ontario: Statistical Society of Canada.

StatCan
1987 Addendum to The Daily, 3 December 1987, 16 pp.

Termote, Marc & Danielle Gauvreau
1988 La situation demolinguistic du Quebec. Quebec, Quebec: Conseil de la langue francaise, xxi + 292 pp. ISBN 2-551-08254-4.

APPENDIX:

Hypotheses for emergence of multiethnicities

The purely arithmetical exercises in sections 3 and 4 provide considerable insights into the differential behaviour of ethnic groups under the impact of the new census difinition inviting respondents to record their ethnicity in terms of multiples. These exercises also suggest the working of various influences that could usefully be isolated. The following hypotheses are offered for consideration.

(i) The larger the ethnic group the less intermarriage experience (flowing out of the hypotheses of Blau and associates), if only for arithmetical or geometric reason.

(ii) The longer the ethnic group had been in Canada on the average the more intermarriage experience.

(iii) The less dispersion or the more concentration, the less intermarriage experience (similar to the heterogeneity stressed by Bali Ram during another session at this symposium).

(iv) In-groups because of their supreme confidence have less intermarriage than out-groups with their anxiety to conform (or is it "more" because the in-groups are more desirable and out-groups are good at seducing?)

(v) Current age distribution (average age, proportion of young, etc.) is irrelevant to past experience of intermarriage and anyhow the inter-ethnic differences are too small to affect our measurements, currently crude.

(vi) The residuals are due then to purely ethnic idiosyncrasies; one could thus bring out explanations of the racist variety, but is it not rather primitive to jump so readily to an explanation of the residual? After all, most of theses we supervise are left with 40 or 50 (or even 70?) per cent of unexplained variability. In fact, practicing sociologists begin to talk in terms of multicollinearity, when the proportion explained becomes too high.